



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/857,480	08/13/2002	Robert Heger	49619	4809
7590 11/30/2005 KEIL & WEINKAUF			EXAMINER	
			YOUNG, MICAH PAUL	
1350 CONNECTICUT AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20036			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1618	
			DATE MAILED: 11/30/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/857,480	HEGER ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Micah-Paul Young	1618				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the (correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tince will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 S</u>	Sentember 2005					
	s action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		osecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Disposition of Claims	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>15-25</u> is/are pending in the application	nn					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>15-25</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement					
are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ction is required if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreigr a) All b) Some * c) None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 	Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal F	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	*F				

Application/Control Number: 09/857,480 Page 2

Art Unit: 1618

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgment of Papers Received: Request for Continued Examination dated 9/6/05.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 3. Claims 15-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined disclosures of List et al (USPN 5,389,382 hereafter 382) and Liversidge et al (USPN 6,045,829 hereafter '829).
- 4. List discloses a hydrosol of a pharmaceutical agent in an intravenous applicable, stabilized form, which is suspended or is dry and re-suspendable in an aqueous medium. The hydrosol contains solid active agent particles (abstract). The hydrosol is started from a solution of a hardly water-soluble active substance in a water-miscible solvent. This solution is mixed with a relatively large amount of water containing a water-soluble colloid, for example gelatin. Alternatively or additionally, a water-insoluble colloid can be dissolved in the organic solvent. The colloid stabilized that active substance hydrosol formed when the phases are brought together. The organic solvent is then removed. In Examples 4,9 and 10 the active agent and ethyl cellulose are first dissolved in ethanol. The ethanolic phase is then stirred into an aqueous phase containing gelatin or a collagen hydrolysate. The ethanol is evaporated. The average

Application/Control Number: 09/857,480

Art Unit: 1618

Page 3

diameter of the suspended particles is 245 nm, 129 nm, and 320 nm. The nanoparticles and their hydrosols correspond to the preparations defined in the instant claims. Ethyl cellulose acts as the core polymer, while gelatin or collagen hydrolysate act as the sheathing/coating polymers. List discloses a different mixing procedure. However the claims are open to the inclusion of further processing steps that are not a detriment to the resulting product. Since the additional steps required by List result in a similar product as that of the instant claims it is the position of the Examiner that the disclosures of List render the claims obviated barring evidence to the contrary.

- 5. List however is silent to the inclusion of casein or sodium casienate in the polymer coating shell, though the inclusion of the polymer is well within the level of skill in the art. Liversidge discloses surface stabilized nanoparticles (abstract). The surface stabilizers are used in conjunction other stabilizers and include water soluble and insoluble polymers (col. 7, lin. 18-25). Some of the stabilizers include gelatin, casein and lecithin (col. 7, lin.; 30-35). The particles are made continuously by mixing the drug with a cellulosic polymers and further spray drying the resultant (col. 10, lin. 9-28). The resultant particles range in size from 100 to 400 nm (claims). An artisan of ordinary skill would have been motivated to include the excipients, including the casein of Liversidge in to the formulation in order to modify the release rate of the coated drug, and improve its' stability.
- 6. With these things in mind it would have been motivated to follow the suggestions of List to include similar compound to that of gelatin in the form of the casein disclosed by Liversidge. Barring a showing of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to combine these teachings in order to provide improved rate releasing properties and stability. It would have been obvious

to combine the teachings with an expected result of a coated drug with improved stability and rate release properties.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 15-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. However the claims remain rejected by List, which teaches a similar process for a similar purpose. Applicant argues that further steps are required by List to result in fine particles. However applicant has not closed off the language of the claims to exclude such further steps. List results in fine particles mush like those of the instant claims, and barring a showing of unexpected results the claims will remain obviated by the disclosures of List.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Stainmesse et al (USPN 5,133,908) teaches a method of producing nanoparticles comprising a core and a polymeric shell.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Micah-Paul Young whose telephone number is 571-272-0608. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-4:30 every other Monday off.

Application/Control Number: 09/857,480

Art Unit: 1618

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Michael Hartley can be reached on 571-272-0616. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Micah-Paul Young

Examiner Art Unit 1618

Page 5